

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/016,988
Docket: BS01371
Response to August 18, 2006 Office Action

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated August 18, 2006, the Assignee respectfully requests entry and consideration of this amendment. The Assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims distinguish over the cited references to *Picco*, *Williams*, *Tomsen* and *Alexander*, whether considered alone or in combination.

Moreover, similar features as those presented in amended claims 1 and 15 have been recently indicated as allowable by Examiner Ouellette in the related application 10/017,640 (and incorporated by reference). The Assignee thus presents these amended claims for a quick allowance in this application.

Telephone Interview

Examiner Koenig is thanked for the telephone interview of Friday, December 8, 2006. Scott Zimmerman explained that independent claim 1 was being amended to recite similar features as those recently indicated as allowable by Examiner Ouellette in the related application 10/017,640 (and incorporated by reference). While Examiner Koenig professed great respect for Examiner Ouellette, the pending claims greatly differ from their previous form. Examiner Koenig would only say that another search would be performed.

Rejection of Claims under § 102 (b)

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 20, 21, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,045 to *Picco et al.* All the pending claims recite, or incorporate, many features that are not disclosed by *Picco*. Moreover, similar features as those recited in independent claims 1 and 15 have been recently indicated as allowable by Examiner Ouellette in the related application 10/017,640 (and incorporated by reference). The Assignee thus respectfully asserts that the pending claims distinguish over *Picco* and, moreover, that the pending claims are ready for an allowance.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/016,988
Docket: BS01371
Response to August 18, 2006 Office Action

Rejection of Claims under § 103 (a)

The Office also rejects claims 3, 8, 17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Picco* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,945,988 to *Williams, et al.* Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 18, 19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Picco* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0056109 to *Tomsen*. Claims 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Picco*. Claims 14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Picco* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 to *Alexander, et al.*

The pending claims, however, are not obvious. All the pending claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not taught or suggested by *Picco, Williams, Tomsen, and Alexander*, whether considered alone or in combination. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that pending claims are obvious. Moreover, similar features as those recited in independent claims 1 and 15 have been recently indicated as allowable by Examiner Ouellette in the related application 10/017,640 (and incorporated by reference). The Assignee thus respectfully asserts that the pending claims are ready for an allowance.

CONCLUSION

The Assignee will thus submit that independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable. Their respective dependent claims should thus also be considered allowable. The Assignee will thus respectfully solicit a prompt Notice of Allowance of the pending claims.

If Examiner Koenig determines that anything further is desirable to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Assignee's representative at (919) 469-2629 or scott@wzpatents.com.

Respectfully submitted,

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/016,988

Docket: BS01371

Response to August 18, 2006 Office Action



Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
U.S.P.T.O. Reg. No. 41,390